



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/848,662	05/03/2001	Sandeep K. Singhal	20423-10011	7321
34415	7590	08/22/2007		
SYMANTEC/ FENWICK SILICON VALLEY CENTER 801 CALIFORNIA STREET MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94041			EXAMINER PARK, ILWOO	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2182	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/22/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ptoc@fenwick.com
bhoffman@fenwick.com
aprice@fenwick.com

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/848,662

Applicant(s)

SINGHAL ET AL.

Examiner

Ilwoo Park

Art Unit

2182

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Ilwoo Park. (3) _____

(2) Brian G. Brannon. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 08 August 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 9 and 27.

Identification of prior art discussed: Chien [US 2003/0115345 A1].

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Remote Unit of Chien performs the same functions including filtering and rewriting as the 'augmented IP stack' of claims required.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

ILWOO PARK
PRIMARY EXAMINER



Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

***DRAFT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY
NOT FOR FILE***

Proposed Agenda for Interview of Application Serial No. 09/848,662

Time: August 8, 2007, 2 PM (Eastern Time)

Participants: Examiner Ilwoo Park (571) 272-4155

Brian G. Brannon, for Applicant (650) 335-7610

Status of application:

Claims 1-7, 9-29, 31-35 and 37 are pending in this application and stand rejected. On May 21, 2007, a final Office Action was mailed, rejecting claims 1-4, 7, 9-11, 18, 21-23, 27-29, 31-35 and 37 as anticipated by Chien (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0115345). Pending claims 14-17 were rejected as unpatentable over Chien in view of Oz (U.S. Patent No. 6,434,141). Pending claims 5, 6 and 26 were rejected as unpatentable over Chien in view of "well-known in the art." Also, pending claims 12, 13, 19, 20, 24 and 25 were rejected as unpatentable over Chien in view of Maffeis (U.S. Patent No. 6,721,779).

Issues to be discussed:

I would like clarification regarding the rejection based on the Chien reference. In particular, I would like to discuss how Chien discloses an "augmented IP stack." It appears that the rejection cites the illustration of RU 504 in Figure 5 as disclosing the "augmented IP stack" as recited in, for example, claim 27. While it appears that Figure 5 provides a high-level description of the behavior of RU 504, the specification of Chien does not appear to disclose or suggest using an "augmented IP stack" to implement this behavior. It is not clear how the annotations of Figure 5 disclose an "augmented IP stack," and it does not appear from the specification of Chien that details regarding the implementation of this behavior using an "augmented IP stack," or other implementation-specific details, are disclosed. Clarification of how the illustration of RU 504, and Chien overall, can be construed to disclose a "stack," much less an "augmented IP stack" would be appreciated.

While this summary outlines the major points that I would like to discuss during the interview, I am open to discussing any other topics that may arise during the course of the interview.